

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 are amended and Claim 19 is added. Claims 1-19, as amended, remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

The Rejections:

In the Final Office Action dated April 24, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the claim recites the limitation "a mobile authentication device " in step (b) detecting the authentication signal with a mobile authentication device; and "the authentication device" in steps (c) and (d). It is not clear to the Examiner that a mobile authentication device in step (b) is the same as the authentication device in step (c) and (d) of claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 2-6 depend on Claim 1, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Svensson-Hilford et al (US 6,354,405 81).

Referring to Claim 1, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford teaches a method for security checking or transport of persons by an elevator installation comprising the steps of:

- (1) generating at least one authentication signal associated with a person seeking to use the elevator installation (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 4 of Svensson-Hilford);
- (2) detecting the at least one authentication signal with a mobile authentication device (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford);
- (3) the authentication device checking the at least one authentication signal with at least one person reference (column 4, lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford ,
- (4) in the case of correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference, the authentication device providing at least one identification code (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford);
- (5) detecting the at least one identification code with a stationary recognition device of the elevator installation column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford);and
- (6) assigning to the identification code one of a predefined travel destination and an input travel destination input at the recognition device by the person (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

16715

Referring to Claim 2, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches including supplying the authentication device with electrical power from at least one energy source external to the authentication device (column 2, lines 30-40 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 3, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches including selecting as the authentication signal a biometric signal being one of a fingerprint, a hand geometry, a facial profile, an iris pattern, a retinal scan, a thermogram, a smell, a voice, a signature and pressing of a button (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 4, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches including checking whether at least one user reference exists for the detected identification code (column 4, lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 5, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches including comparing the input travel destination with at least one access authorization for generating one of a control signal and an alarm signal (column 4, lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 6, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches including comparing the input travel destination with a list of travel destinations of an access authorization for generating one of a control signal and an alarm signal (column 4, lines 28-65 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 7, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford teaches a system for security checking or transport of persons by an elevator installation comprising:

(1) a mobile authentication device adapted to be carried by a person, said authentication device detecting an authentication signal of the person and checking whether said authentication signal corresponds with a person reference, said authentication device generating an identification code when said authentication signal corresponds to said person reference (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 4; column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford);

(2) a stationary recognition device of the elevator installation for detecting said identification code (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 4 of Svensson-Hilford); and

(3) a checking device connected to said recognition device for assigning to said identification code one of a predefined travel destination and an input travel destination input at

said recognition device by the person to generate a control signal for the elevator installation (column 3, line 55 through column 4, line 35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 8, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said authentication device includes a sensor for generating said authentication signal in the presence of the person (column 2, lines 35-40 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 9, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said sensor is a camera for detecting at least one of a fingerprint, a hand geometry, a facial profile, an iris profile, a retinal scan and a signature of the person (column 2, lines 35-40; column 4, lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 10, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said sensor is one of a thermal camera for detecting a thermogram of the person, a smell sensor for detecting a smell of the person, a microphone for detecting a voice of the person, and a button for detecting pressing of the button by the person (column 2, lines 35-40; column 4, lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 11, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said authentication device is adapted to be powered by an external energy source (column 2, lines 30-40 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 12, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said authentication device includes a transmitting and receiving unit and said recognition device includes a transmitting and receiving unit for communicating said identification code (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 13, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said authentication device includes a data store for storing said person reference and compares said person reference with said authentication signal to generate said identification code (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 14, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said authentication device includes a data store for storing said identification code prior to detecting said authentication signal (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 15, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said recognition device includes input means for receiving said input travel destination from the person (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 16, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing said predefined travel destination (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 17, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing a user reference and compares said user reference with said identification code to generate said control signal (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

Referring to Claim 18, the Examiner stated that Svensson-Hilford further teaches wherein said checking device includes a data store for storing an access authorization and compares said access authorization with one of said predefined travel destination and said input travel destination to generate said control signal (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-44 of Svensson-Hilford).

The Response:

Applicant amended steps (c) and (d) in Claim 1 to recite the "mobile authentication device" and overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant amended Claim 2 in the same manner to be consistent with Claim 1. Applicant added independent Claim 19 which combines the subject matter of Claims 1-6.

Applicant's amended Claim 1 recites a first four steps of:

- a) generating at least one authentication signal associated with a person seeking to use the elevator installation;
- b) detecting the at least one authentication signal with a mobile authentication device;
- c) the mobile authentication device checking the at least one authentication signal with at least one person reference; and
- d) in the case of correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference, the mobile authentication device providing at least one identification code.

The Examiner characterized Applicant's arguments in the previous response as: "Svensson-Hilford does not recite as in claim 1, (b) detecting the authentication signal associated with the person seeking to use the elevator; (c) checking the authentication signal with at person reference; and (d) providing an identification code in the case of correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference.

The Examiner stated: Notice that claim 1 of the instant application recites (b) detecting the authentication signal with a mobile authentication device. It is not the same as (b) detecting the authentication signal associated with the person seeking to use the elevator, like applicant has mentioned in the arguments toward near the last 5 lines of page 8.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. The antecedent basis for "the at least one authentication signal" in step b) is "at least one authentication signal associated with a person seeking to use the elevator installation" recited in step a). Clearly, "the at least one authentication signal" being detected in step b) is the same as the "at least one authentication signal associated with a person seeking to use the elevator installation" being generated in step a).

The Examiner further states that: "At any rate, Svensson-Hilford teaches a card which is the mobile authentication device containing individual data of a user wherein the identification device reads in, receives, or detects the information from the card (column 4, lines 6-8 of Svensson-Hilford)."

The Svensson-Hilford card is not the mobile authentication device recited in steps b), c) and d) of Claim 1. The Svensson-Hilford card does not detect the at least one authentication signal as recited in step b). The Svensson-Hilford card does not check the at least one authentication signal with at least one person reference as recited in step c). The Svensson-Hilford card does not, in the case of correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference, provide at least one identification code as recited in step d). Nowhere in Svensson-Hilford is there any suggestion that the card described in column 4, lines 6-8 can perform any of the steps b), c) and d) as recited in Applicant's Claim 1.

The Examiner stated that: "Furthermore, Svensson-Hilford teaches checking the authentication signal with at person reference by checking the user's authorization are the input of an access code by the user via the trip destination input device 14, or the use of biometrics

16715

systems to register the user's fingerprint or iris, for example, and transmission of this information to the identification device (column 4, lines 28-32 of Svensson-Hilford). Wherein the user provides the access code or user's fingerprints as part of the identification code for authentication. In addition, a time window of 5 to 10 seconds, for example, is necessary so that the particular transportation service can be matched unambiguously to the relevant user and then assigned to the relevant account (column 4, lines 37-40 of Svensson-Hilford). Hence, Svensson-Hilford teaches the claimed subject matter."

According to the Examiner, Svensson-Hilford generates "at least one authentication signal associated with a person seeking to use the elevator installation" (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 4). Svensson-Hilford discusses the identification device 15 that is located at each floor and in the elevator car for identifying user data and/or means of payment. However, there is no mention in the cited passage that the identification device 15 generates an authentication signal associated with a person seeking to use the elevator installation as recited in Applicant's Claim 1.

According to the Examiner, Svensson-Hilford detects "the at least one authentication signal with a mobile authentication device" (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35). The Examiner identified the card as the "mobile authentication device". However, there is no mention in the cited passages that the card detects any signal much less "at least one authentication signal" as recited in Applicant's Claim 1.

According to the Examiner, Svensson-Hilford has an authentication device that checks "the at least one authentication signal with at least one person reference" (column 4, lines 28-35). Svensson-Hilford discusses the user inputting an access code via the trip destination input device 14, or a biometrics system for inputting fingerprint or iris data, wherein the code or the data is transmitted to the identification device 15. Note that these are further means of checking the user's authorization (column 4, lines 28-35) because there is no mention of the card providing such authorization. For example, the user could have borrowed the card from the person to whom it was issued and the identification device 15 can't ascertain the true identity of the user from the data provided by the card. However, there is no mention in the cited passage that the card, identified by the Examiner as the "mobile authentication device", checks "the at least one authentication signal with at least one person reference" as recited in Applicant's Claim 1.

16715

According to the Examiner, Svensson-Hilford has, "in the case of correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference, the authentication device providing at least one identification code" (column 4, lines 6-14; lines 28-35). However, there is no mention in the cited passages that the card, identified by the Examiner as the "mobile authentication device", responds to any signal including "correspondence of the authentication signal and the person reference" or generate any identification code as a result.

The invention recited in Applicant's claims relates to a method for a double security check in front of an elevator installation. For doing so, the person to be checked carries a mobile authentication device similar to a credit card and which may comprise a sensor, a processor and a memory with a person reference. The person to be checked performs a first authentication test by taking a biometric signal with the sensor, the processor compares the biometric signal with the person reference and issues an identification code if the authentication test is positive. The identification code is an RF signal generated by the mobile authentication device, which signal is detected by a stationary recognition device of the elevator installation. The elevator installation comprises a processor and a memory with a user reference. The processor compares the identification code with the user reference. If this second identification test is positive, a control signal is issued to an elevator control in order to transport the person to a travel destination. Thus, the mobile authentication device identifies the user and then the stationary recognition device confirms the identification.

The Examiner appears to have confused the functions of the card, the identification device 15, and the trip destination input device 14 of Svensson-Hilford. The only mobile device disclosed in Svensson-Hilford is the card or the transmitter/receiver system with individual data which is read into or received by the identification device 15 (column 4, lines 6-8). Neither the card nor the transmitter/receiver system performs the steps b), c) and d) recited in amended Claim 1. Rather the Svensson-Hilford card or the transmitter/receiver system merely transmits individual data to the identification device 15. There is no authentication of the user whatsoever when only the card or the transmitter/receiver system is used. In order to identify the user, the user must input an access code via the trip destination input device 14, or input fingerprint or iris data via a biometrics system. However, the access code and the fingerprint or iris data are not

input to the card or the transmitter/receiver system, the "mobile authentication device" identified by the Examiner, as recited in Applicant's Claim 1.

From the Svensson-Hilford passages quoted by the Examiner in support of his rejection of Claim 1 (column 4, lines 6-14 and lines 28-35), the Examiner views the systems of the two cited passages as complimentary rather than alternative. This is clearly not the case since at column 4, lines 28-35, Svensson-Hilford introduces the second alternative and then states that after identification, the calculation, authorization, and charging then take place in the same way as for the card with individual data for the transmitter/receiver system of the first alternative. Therefore, the Examiner's apparent combination of features from the two alternatives is not permissible.

The alternatives to the card or the transmitter/receiver identification system, mentioned in Svensson-Hilford, are to either type in an access code via the trip destination input device 14 or through the use of a biometric system (Col. 4, Lines 28-35). However, at Col. 2, Lines 53-55 Svensson-Hilford explicitly states that the trip destination input devices 14 are fixed on each of the floors E0, E1 and E2 and, without an explicit teaching to the contrary, it is assumed that the biometric system is also fixed on each of the floors. Accordingly, these stationary alternatives do not provide Applicants' step of: b) detecting the authentication signal with a mobile authentication device.

Applicant's remarks above also apply to the rejection of independent Claim 7. The Svensson-Hilford card or transmitter/receiver system does not detect an authentication signal of the person, does not check whether the authentication signal corresponds with a person reference, and does not generate an identification code when said authentication signal corresponds to the person reference.

Accordingly, Applicant's Claims 1-6 and 19 (method) and 7-18 (system) are not anticipated by Svensson-Hilford.

In the *Conclusion* section, the Examiner stated that "Weber et al (US 5,679,933) discloses control panels for elevators (see Title) and that Claims 1-18 of the instant application also read on by Weber's prior art." Applicant is uncertain whether the Examiner intended to reject Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or just identify prior art not relied upon that is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

16715

The Weber patent shows control panels that are mounted in a cavity of a wall of a passenger car of an elevator (column 2, lines 63-65). All of the embodiments shown are used solely for entering a destination by an elevator user (column 1, lines 56-61). There is no "authentication signal" and no "mobile authentication device". In addition, the only "identification code" is related to the embodiment shown in Fig. 8 and described in column 3, lines 57-65 that requires the user to input a password into a stationary device either via keypad or by voice command, thus permitting him to select a desired floor. Thus, Weber does not anticipate the invention recited in Applicant's Claims 1-19.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicant believes that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.